

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/665,780	09/20/2000		Herman Chien	1999-0804	6102	
30083	7590	11/30/2004		EXAMINER		
PERKINS (	COIE LLP/A	AWS	NGUYEN, DUC MINH			
P.O. BOX 1247 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,	<b>22.11.22,</b> > 2000.			2643		
				DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004	DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/665,780	CHIEN, HERMAN					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
·	Duc Nguyen	2643					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app							
Period for Reply		•					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to ywithin the statutory minimum of thirty (30) dawill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•						
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	-					
Application Papers	1						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	•					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	<del>- '</del>						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage					
Attachment(e)	· .						
Attachment(s)  1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/665,780

Art Unit: 2643

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ensor et al (5,721,780) in view of Hartmaier (6,553,022).

Consider claim 1. Ensor teaches a network (fig. 1) that utilizes a modem (step 300, figs. 3) for processing calls made through the network, comprising a server (service bureau 108, figs.1 and 3; column(s) 3, line(s) 31-50; column(s) 4, line(s) 51 to column(s) 6, line(s) 6); a search module (transaction manager 114, figs. 3) for searching a database (112, figs. 3). Ensor, however, does not teach a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module.

Hartmaier teaches a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module (col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10; especially col. 5, ln. 50 to col. 6, ln. 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Hartmaier into the teachings of Ensor in order to allow for revenue sharing between the data network service providers and the company operating the nodes which provided the physical connection to the data network.

Consider claims 2-4. Hartmaier's fig. 1-3, and col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10 read on the limitations of claims 2-4.

Application/Control Number: 09/665,780

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claims 5, 9, 13, 17. Ensor further teaches the network comprises a wireless network (column(s) 3, line(s) 31-50).

Consider claim 6. Ensor teaches a network (fig. 1) that utilizes a modem (step 300, figs. 3) for processing calls made through the network, comprising a server (service bureau 108, figs.1 and 3; column(s) 3, line(s) 31-50; column(s) 4, line(s) 51 to column(s) 6, line(s) 6); a search module (transaction manager 114, figs. 3) for searching a database (112, figs. 3). Ensor, however, does not teach a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module.

Hartmaier teaches a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module (col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10; especially col. 5, ln. 50 to col. 6, ln. 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Hartmaier into the teachings of Ensor in order to allow for revenue sharing between the data network service providers and the company operating the nodes which provided the physical connection to the data network.

Consider claims 7-8. Hartmaier's fig. 1-3, col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10 read on the limitations of claims 7-8.

Consider claims 10-12. Ensor teaches a network (fig. 1) that utilizes a modem (step 300, figs. 3) for processing calls made through the network, comprising a server (service bureau 108, figs.1 and 3; column(s) 3, line(s) 31-50; column(s) 4, line(s) 51 to column(s) 6, line(s) 6); a search module (transaction manager 114, figs. 3) for searching a database (112, figs. 3). Ensor, however, does not teach a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module.

Hartmaier teaches a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module (col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10; especially col. 5, ln. 50 to col. 6, ln. 10).

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/665,780

Art Unit: 2643

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Hartmaier into the teachings of Ensor in order to allow for revenue sharing between the data network service providers and the company operating the nodes which provided the physical connection to the data network.

Consider claim 14. Hartmaier further teaches the user places a telephone call via a modem pool (modem pool 210 or 260; fig. 2).

Consider claims 15-16. Ensor teaches a network (fig. 1) that utilizes a modem (step 300, figs. 3) for processing calls made through the network, comprising a server (service bureau 108, figs. 1 and 3; column(s) 3, line(s) 31-50; column(s) 4, line(s) 51 to column(s) 6, line(s) 6); a search module (transaction manager 114, figs. 3) for searching a database (112, figs. 3). Ensor, however, does not teach a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module.

Hartmaier teaches a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module (col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10; especially col. 5, ln. 50 to col. 6, ln. 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Hartmaier into the teachings of Ensor in order to allow for revenue sharing between the data network service providers and the company operating the nodes which provided the physical connection to the data network.

Consider claim 18. The method as taught by Ensor in view of Hartmaier is inherently performed for each of multiple users of the network who would like to access an ISP via a modem pool.

## Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 09/665,780

Art Unit: 2643

Page 5

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-308-7527. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 703-305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-6000.

Duc Nguyen

**Primary Examiner** 

Art Unit 2643

11/25/04